

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Final office action of November 30, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 6, and 12-23 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification. See, e.g., specification at page 27. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-23 remain in this application.

Claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 14, 16, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers ("Using Graphic History in Browsing the World Wide Web," Proc. 4th Intl. WWW Conference, Boston, December 1995) in view of Bukszar (U.S. Patent No. 6,133,916). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 6, and 16, as amended, recite comparing the accessed web page content to a previously accessed web page content and displaying the thumbnail snapshot if the accessed web page content and the previously accessed web page content are not the same. Ayers and Bukszar, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest these features. Ayers explicitly discloses: "The browser makes no attempt to determine if two different URLs reference the same document, so sometimes the same document can appear more than once in the Graphic History view." Thus, Ayers "teaches away" from claims 1, 6, and 16, as amended. It is respectfully submitted the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12, 14, 21, and 22 depend from claim 1, 6, or 16, and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claims 1, 6, or 16. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 7, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers and Bukszar in view of Hightower ("Graphical Multiscale Web histories", ACM Hypertext '98 Conference, June 20-24, 1998), Claims 3, 4, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers and Bukszar in view of Hightower and Collins-Rector (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,398). Claims 5, 10, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers and Bukszar in view of Kandogan ("Elastic Windows: A Hierarchical Multi-Window World-Wide Web Browser", 1997, ACM, pp. 169-177). Claims 13, 15, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers and Bukszar in view of Robertson ("Data Mountain: Using Spatial Memory for document Management",

1998, ACM, pp. 153-162). Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers and Bukszar in view of Collins-Rector. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 17-20, and 23 depend from claim 1, 6, or 16. As set forth above, the combination of Ayers and Bukszar fails to teach or suggest claim 1, 6, or 16. Hightower, Collins-Rector, Kandogan, Robertson, or any combination thereof, fails to cure the deficiencies of Ayers and Bukszar. Nor does the Office Action assert that any combination of Hightower, Collins-Rector, Kandogan, or Robertson does cure the deficiencies of Ayers and Bukszar as set forth above. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.



By:

Bradley C. Wright
Registration No. 38,061

Dated: February 24, 2006

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001